



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/839,078	04/20/2001	Ping Sheng Zhang	29876/37280	2715

7590 04/21/2005

ALBERT WAI-KIT CHAN, ATTN AT LAW
DEHENG CHEN CHAN, LLC
141-07 20TH AVE., SUITE 604
WHITESTONE, NY 11357

EXAMINER

HORTON, YVONNE MICHELE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3635

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/839,078

Applicant(s)

PING SHENG ZHANG

Examiner

Yvonne M. Horton

Art Unit

3635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13-21 and 23-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 22 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☒ Other: SEE ATTACHMENT

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

The request filed on 2/8/05 for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114 based on parent Application No. 09/839,078 is acceptable and a RCE has been established. An action on the RCE follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 13-17 and 24-25 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent #5,822,944 to PENLAND, Sr. In reference to claims 13 and 24, PENLAND, Sr. discloses the use of a flexible flooring (10) including a first top layer (12) consisting of a plurality of strips (16) secured together and having a grain extending in a longitudinal direction, and a second bottom layer (14) consisting of a plurality of strips (26) also having a grain extending transversely to the first plurality of longitudinal strips (16) wherein the second bottom plurality of strips (26) are spaced by a gaps (G), see the marked attachment. Regarding claim 14, the second bottom layer (14) also includes tongues (32) and grooves (formed by gaps G) for attaching adjacent planks (10). In reference to claims 15 and 25, the tongues (32) and grooves (formed by gaps G) extend along the length of the plank (10). Regarding claim 16, the strips (16,26) are wood, column 2, line 44. In reference to claim 17, the gaps (G) are equal.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 18-21,23 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent #5,822,944 to PENLAND, Sr. In reference to claims 18 and 19, PENLAND, Sr. is silent with regards to the width of his gaps (G). Hence, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select a known gap size suitable for the use intended as an obvious matter of design choice. For instance, if little to no expansion of the members is expected a tighter fit between the interengaging strips might be warranted; wherein the gap and tongue sizes would be relatively the same. However, if room is required to expansion and contraction of the strips then perhaps a gap size a little larger than the tongue size might be appropriate. Regarding claims 20,21 and 26, the method of forming the strip is germane to the issue of patentability of the flexible flooring member itself. Thus, the

Art Unit: 3635

steps of rough cutting and machining have not been given considerable weight. In reference to claim 23, although PENLAND, Sr. is silent in this regard, wood flooring is old and very well known in the art for having an acrylic layer of some sort disposed thereon. Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the flooring of PENLAND, Sr. with an acrylic layer.

Allowable Subject Matter


Claim 22 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yvonne M. Horton whose telephone number is (703) 308-1909. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 am - 3:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl D. Friedman can be reached on (571) 272-6845. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Art Unit: 3635

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Yvonne M. Horton
Art Unit 3635
4/16/05

ATTACHMENT

